

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/606,786	06/27/2003	Sandrine Decoster	238017US0	6389	
	7590 11/19/200 AK MCCLELLAND	EXAMINER			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			ARNOLD, ERNST V		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1616			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/19/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	_		
10/606,786	DECOSTER ET AL.	DECOSTER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Ernst V. Arnold	1616			

3	LAGITITICI	AILOIIIL						
-	Ernst V. Arnold	1616						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress					
THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	•							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since					
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	• •	donina an aime lifetica	4h - i f					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	aucing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4: h. 61-d	4!: 4b					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	nowabie ii submitted iii a separate,	unlery med amending	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected to:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 44-46.								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.					
 11.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
13. Other:								
SOHANNAUHIEN SIGHANNAUHIEN SIGHANNAUHIEN SIGHANNAUHIEN								
CROUP (ZOD)								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references and that the claimed compositions have unexpected benefits. The Examiner cannot agree. The instantly claimed quaternary ammonium silicone polymer is taught in the art for application to the hair. The instantly claimed fatty alcohols are taught in the art for application to the hair. It is merely ordinary innovation to combine the two to arrive at another product for the hair. The alleged benefits do not appear to be surprising at all as explained in the Office Action filed on 7/13/07. Applicant continues to argue about the clear compositions of Janchitraponvej et al. and that one of ordinary skill in the art would not add a fatty alcohol because this would result in a non-transparent composition. This argument is without merit because the addition of the fatty alcohol to the Quaternium 80 polymer produces a transparent composition as demonstrated by Applicant.. In addition, the claims are not commensurate in scope with the showing. Claims 1-43 remain rejected and claims 44-46 are withdrawn.